

RECEIVED

MAY 14 2007



Pitney Bowes Inc.

Sr. Corporate Counsel
Intellectual Property & Technology Law
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000

203-924-3934
203-924-3919 Fax
Michael.Cummings@pb.com
www.pitneybowes.com

Facsimile

To: Examiner: J.A. Morrison
Fax No.: (571) 273-8300
From: Michael J. Cummings
Date: May 14, 2007
Subject: 10/694,503 (F-591-01)
Pages: 15 pages including cover sheet

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to:

Patent and Trademark Office
Attn.: Examiner: J.A. Morrison
Facsimile No.: (571)-273-8300

1. Corrected Appeal Brief Transmittal (1 page); and
2. Corrected Appeal Brief for Application Serial No.:10/694,503 (F-591-01) (13 pages);

May 14, 2007
Date of Transmission


Signature

Marlene Massop
Name

May 14, 2007
Date

MAY 14 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application:

Appl. No. : 10/694,503 Confirmation No.:2665
Applicant : Surya Sagi, et al.
Filed : October 24, 2003
Art Unit : 2168
Examiner : Jay A. Morrison
Attorney Docket No. : F-591-01 Date: May 14, 2007

TRANSMITTAL OF CORRECTED APPEAL BRIEF
(PATENT APPLICATION 37 CFR 1.192)

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is a **CORRECTED APPEAL BRIEF** in the above-identified patent application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on November 21, 2006.


The fee for an Appeal Brief for this application was submitted on February 16, 2007. **No additional fee is due for the Corrected Appeal Brief.**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 16-1885.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Cummings
Reg. No. 46,650
Attorney for Appellants
Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faxed to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on Fax No.: 571-273-8300	
on May 14, 2007 Date of Deposit	Marlene Messop Name
 Signature	May 14, 2007 Date

(10067556.1)

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 14 2007

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re patent application:

Appl. No. : 10/694,503 Confirmation No.:2665
Applicant : Surya Sagi, et al.
Filed : October 24, 2003
Art Unit : 2168
Examiner : Jay A. Morrison.
Attorney Docket No. : F-591-O1 Date: May 14, 2007


Mail Stop Appeal Brief- Patents
Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANT'S CORRECTED BRIEF ON APPEAL

Sir:

In response to a Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief, dated April 18, 2007, the appellant respectfully submits the following corrected Appeal Brief in the appeal of the above-identified application. This Brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on November 21, 2006, following a Final Office Action mailed August 22, 2006.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for this appeal or to make this brief timely or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 16-1885.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE</u>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faxed to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on Fax No.: 571-273-8300	
on <u>May 14, 2007</u> Date of Deposit	<u>Marlene Masson</u> Name
 Signature	<u>May 14, 2007</u> Date

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-Q1

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 14 2007

I. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest in this appeal is Pitney Bowes Inc., a Delaware corporation, the assignee of this application.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

None.

III. Status of Claims

- (1) Claims 1-16 are the subject of this Appeal, and stand rejected.
- (2) Appellants hereby appeal the rejection of claims 1-16.

IV. Status of Amendments

In response to an Office Action dated April 17, 2006, in which claims 1-16 were rejected, claims 1 and 6-8 were amended in the Amendment dated July 14, 2006. In response to a Final Office Action dated August 22, 2006, a Pre Appeal Brief Conference Request and a Notice of Appeal were submitted. No further amendments were made subsequent to the final rejection. Claims Appendix, attached hereto, contains current claims 1-16 on appeal.

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**Claim 1**

Claim1 addresses the shortcomings of the prior art by providing a system for gathering and transmitting detailed inserter machine data to one or more clients (Fig.1, page 5, line 12 to page 6, line 4). The inserter controller gathers data relating to the operation of the machine and the processing of mail pieces (page 6, lines 5-9). A feature of the present invention is that the gathered data is predetermined to comprise substantially all significant machine data from machine sensors and control routines (page 6, lines 10-18).

The gathered data is stored in a compressed format in a journal device (page 6, line 19 to page 7, line 2). The journaling mechanism includes algorithms and software by which machine control software can output data at a high level of detail about all of its essential functions to a file in a highly compressed format (Figs. 3 & 4, page 7, lines 3 -17).

A further component of the invention is a data pump mechanism (Figs. 1 & 2). The data pump can process the compressed journal data, extract those parts that are of interest, and transmit them to client applications in a format that is easily interpreted (page 8, line 6 to page 9, line 6). The data pump processing includes selecting a subset of data from the journal that is of interest to the particular client, and affirmately sending it to that client. (ID)

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

Claim 9

Claim 9 addresses the shortcomings of the prior art by providing a method for gathering and transmitting detailed inserter machine data to one or more clients (Fig.1, page 5, line 12 to page 6, line 4). The inserter controller gathers data relating to the operation of the machine and the processing of mail pieces (page 6, lines 5-9). A feature of the present invention is that the gathered data is predetermined to comprise substantially all significant machine data from machine sensors and control routines (page 6, lines 10-18).

The gathered data is stored in a compressed format in a journal device (page 6, line 19 to page 7, line 2). The journaling mechanism includes algorithms and software by which machine control software can output data at a high level of detail about all of its essential functions to a file in a highly compressed format (Figs. 3 & 4, page 7, lines 3 -17).

A further component of the invention is a data pump mechanism (Figs. 1 & 2). The data pump can process the compressed journal data, extract those parts that are of interest, and transmit them to client applications in a format that is easily interpreted (page 8, line 6 to page 9, line 6). The data pump processing includes selecting a subset of data from the journal that is of interest to the particular client, and affirmately sending it to that client. (ID)

This summary is not intended to supplant the description of the claimed subject matter as provided in the claims 1-16 as recited in Appendix A, as understood in light of the entire specification.

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

(1) Whether claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,965,895, Smith, et al ("Smith").

(2) Whether claims 6-7, 14-15 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Smith, et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,990,497 O'Rourke, et al. ("O'Rourke").

VII. Argument**35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

Claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,965,895 to Smith ("Smith"). Claims 1 and 9 are the respective system and apparatus independent claims. Appellants submit that this rejection should be reversed because the asserted reference fails to disclose or suggest recited elements and steps of the rejected claims.

The asserted Smith reference is directed to a system for gathering data in a circuit chip fabrication facility and for performing detailed analysis on that data. Appellants note that Smith does not disclose or suggest a system using an "inserter controller" or a method for gathering "inserter machine" data, as recited in independent claims 1 and 9. The nature of the inserter controller and machine are significant in that the manner of handling and processing data gathered by such components is different that in the circuit manufacturing industry. In any case, no *prima facie* case of anticipation has been made, since Smith fails to disclose those recited features.

Another significant difference is that Smith does not disclose or suggest the "data pump" element or step for, "processing compressed data from the journal and transmitting the processed data in a format suitable for a particular client."

Smith describes details for gathering data in a circuit manufacturing process. The data that is gathered by Smith is then used differently than as claimed in claims 1

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

and 9 of the present application. In particular, the "data pump" element of claim 1, and "processing" and "transmitting" steps of claim 9 affirmatively push the desired data to the client. This feature is not present in Smith.

Claim 1 recites:

a data pump configured to process compressed data from the journal and to transmit the processed data in a format suitable for a particular client, the data pump processing configuration including selecting a subset of data from the journal that is of interest to the particular client.

Claim 9 recites:

processing compressed data from the journal and transmitting the processed data in a format suitable for a particular client, the processing including selecting a subset of data from the journal that is of interest to the particular client.

Smith only describes a system whereby the gathered data is stored in a database, and may be accessed in the database. Smith therefore does not disclose the data pump or the identified method steps that affirmatively push the data in the proper format to the appropriate client recipient. Nor does Smith describe selecting a subset of the data that is of interest to a particular client, as recited in claims 1 and 9.

The specification of the present application is helpful for illuminating the distinction. The "data pump" element, and corresponding method steps, are described in the following and other passages:

The data pump 2 takes responsibility for making sure that the correct data is transmitted to the clients 4. This arrangement relieves the responsibility of retrieving data from the clients 4. Since clients 4 may be comprised of a variety of different types of applications, without the data pump 2 it would be difficult to ensure that the clients 4 were reliably receiving information. Data pump 2 includes client drivers 8 and data link 9 to facilitate providing the individualized data needs to each of the clients 4. Each client driver 8 ensures that the data is properly transmitted from the data pump 2. Some clients 4 may receive information in a format suitable for a database, while others may receive text information. Data pump 2 ensures that the information is transmitted in the format most easily understood by the client 4. Data pump 2 can provide journal

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

data for all mail runs, and clients 4 can receive data for status changes as they happen.

See page 8, lines 6-17.

Thus it will be understood that the "data pump" element recited in claim 1, along with the "processing" and "selecting" steps of claim 9, are not disclosed in Smith. Accordingly, it is submitted that these § 102(e)rejections should be reversed, along with the rejections of the dependent claims, 2-5, 8, 10-13 and 16 that depend from those claims.

Claims 2-5 and 10-13

Claims 2-5 and 10-13 further claim specific system details and steps for handling data stored in the journal storage system. In particular, those claims recite specific arrangements for storing information in connection with different mail runs, and/or in connection with particular inserter machines. Since Smith fails to describe anything about mail runs or inserter machines, or ways of organizing journal files around those criteria, it is submitted that these claims should be allowed for those reasons, independently from the reasons described above in connection with independent claims 1 and 9.

Claims 6 and 14

Claims 6 and 14 describe a feature and step for the data pump to determine which clients are currently active. Smith fails to describe such a feature, and it is submitted that these claims include patentable subject matter, independent of the reasons given above in connection with claims 1 and 9.

35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

Claims 6-7 and 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Smith in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,990,497 to O'Rourke ("O'Rourke"). O'Rourke is directed to a system for dynamic streaming media management, and does not cure

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-01

deficiencies identified above with respect to Smith. Further, O'Rourke fails to disclose the features recited in dependent claims 6, 7, 14 and 15.

In claim 6, the data pump is configured to determine whether clients are currently active. (See also the corresponding method at claim 14). This feature is not disclosed in O'Rourke, which is directed to providing requested streaming media to clients. There is no description of determine whether clients are currently active in O'Rourke.


O'Rourke merely discloses that a streaming media can be started and stopped, but there is no disclosure of monitoring whether a client is on-line. O'Rourke further fails to disclose resumption of transmitting data when a client comes back on-line, as recited in claims 7 and 15.

O'Rourke is from a non-analogous art for purposes of combination with Smith. Neither reference includes a suggestion to combine the disclosure of O'Rourke with the disclosure of Smith to create anything covered by the rejected claims. Accordingly it is requested that these rejections be overruled.

VIII. Conclusion

In Conclusion, Appellant respectfully submits that the final rejections of independent claims 1-16 are in error for at least the reasons given above and should, therefore, be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Cummings
Reg. No. 46,650
Attorney for Appellants
Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A system for gathering and transmitting detailed inserter machine data to one or more clients, the system comprising:

an inserter controller gathering machine data, the controller programmed to gather predetermined machine data comprising substantially all significant machine data from machine sensors and control routines;

a journal storage system configured to store machine data gathered by the inserter controller in a compressed format;

a data pump configured to process compressed data from the journal and to transmit the processed data in a format suitable for a particular client, the data pump processing configuration including selecting a subset of data from the journal that is of interest to the particular client.

2. The system of claim 1 wherein the journal storage system includes journal files, wherein each journal file stores data for a different mail run.

3. The system of claim 2 wherein the journal storage system stores machine data for a plurality of inserter machines and each data element is associated with a journal thread within the journal files.

4. The system of claim 3 wherein each journal thread is associated with a particular inserter machine.

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

5. The system of claim 4 wherein the data stored in the journal storage system comprises event entries, thread context entries, and system information entries.

6. The system of claim 1 wherein the data pump is configured to determine whether clients are currently active.

7. The system of claim 6 wherein the data pump is configured to track what data has been transmitted to each client, and whereby if a particular client goes offline, the data pump is configured to resume transmittal at a point where transmittal was interrupted.

8. The system of claim 1 wherein the data pump is configured to translate the compressed data from the journal storage system to an XML format.

9. A method for gathering and transmitting detailed inserter machine data to one or more clients, the method comprising:

gathering predetermined machine data comprising substantially all significant machine data from machine sensors and control routines;

storing gathered machine data in a compressed format;

processing compressed data from the journal and transmitting the processed data in a format suitable for a particular client, the processing including selecting a subset of data from the journal that is of interest to the particular client.

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

10. The method of claim 9 wherein the step of storing includes storing data for different mail runs in different journal files.

11. The method of claim 10 wherein the step of storing further includes storing machine data for a plurality of inserter machines and each data element is associated with a journal thread in the journal files.

12. The method of claim 11 further including associating each journal thread with a particular inserter machine.

13. The method of claim 12 wherein the step of storing includes storing data entries comprising event entries, thread context entries, and system information entries.

14. The method of claim 9 further comprising determining whether clients are currently active.

15. The method of claim 14 further comprising tracking what data has been transmitted to each client, and whereby if a particular client goes offline, resuming transmittal later in time at a point where transmittal was interrupted.

16. The system of claim 9 further comprising translating the stored compressed data to an XML format prior to transmittal to a client.

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

Serial No.: 10/694,503

Attorney Docket No.: F-591-O1

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None